

Attorney's Docket No.:07977-258001

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Initially, the rejection indicates that the priority documents were not received. However, these priority documents were in fact filed with the originally filed application on November 27, 2000. Note the attached copy of the Patent Office return receipt postcard which indicates that an 83 page priority document was filed. Official consideration and citation is respectfully requested.

The rejection indicates that there was an Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 2, 2002 which failed to comply with rule 98. However, it is respectfully suggested that this may be in error. A response to restriction was filed on August 28, 2002, and that document may have been the one referred to in the official action. However, that was merely a response to restriction and not an information disclosure statement.

The Examiner is thanked for the suggested title, and this suggested title has been adopted.

The rejection objects that there is no brief description of figure 26 and 27. However, it is respectfully suggested that page 5-6 in fact does include a brief description of figures 26

Attorney's Docket No.:07977-258001

and 27. For these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that this rejection is also in error.

Claim 20 stands objected to as allegedly being indefinite. In response, claim 20 as been amended to remove the indefinite alternative recitation.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Wilcoxon. Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 20 stand rejected as being obvious over Wilcoxon in view of Yonehara. However, these contentions are respectfully traversed. Independent claims 1 and 7 both disclose a material with a tensile stress of 8×10^9 dynes per centimeter or more in contact with a semiconductor film formed on a substrate with an impurity element being gettered into the material. Wilcoxon does not teach this combination and specifically does not teach an impurity element in a semiconductor film being gettered into the material as defined by claims 1 and 7. For these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection is incorrect, and that all of these claims should be in condition for allowance.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Wilcoxon and in view of Yonehara. Again, for reasons stated above, neither of Wilcoxon or Yonehara, nor the hypothetical combination thereof, teaches a semiconductor film being gettered into a material as defined in

Attorney's Docket No.:07977-258001


the independent claims. For these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection does not meet the patent office's burden of providing a prima fascia showing of unpatentability.

New claims 60 - 66 are also added herein. New independent claim 61 reads on the embodiment 1.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, therefore, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Please apply \$410.00 for a two month extension and any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Date: 03/27/03

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Customer Number: 20985 *  *
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10283499.doc

FAX RECEIVED

MAR 27 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800